

war. While draftees comprise only about 10 percent of the men serving in the Army, more than 30 percent of the men serving in Vietnam are draftees. Draftees account for 32 percent of the American deaths which have been sustained in Vietnam. And looking only at Army personnel, draftees account for 55 percent of the battle deaths among Army enlisted men.

A recent article which appeared in the August 15, 1970, issue of the National Journal, entitled "Defense Report—Draftees Shoulder Burden of Fighting and Dying in Vietnam," showed that an Army draftee's chances of going to Vietnam have fluctuated between 50 and 80 percent. And his chances of being killed or wounded are about 54 percent greater than that of his Regular Army counterpart.

It is insupportable that draftees—conscripted without reference to their feelings regarding the tragic Vietnam war—are the fodder which feeds the death machine in Asia. If a draftee does not consent to serve in Vietnam, he should not be sent there; he should not be called upon to risk his life for the repressive Thieu-Ky regime in what is essentially a civil war. If Congress is unwilling to end the war, as I believe it should by ceasing to appropriate the money, the least Congress can do is to end sending young men to fight in it without their consent.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR ESSENTIAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, for myself and 25 of my colleagues, H.R. 4001 and H.R. 4160, legislation to provide supplemental funding for fiscal year 1971 for five essential programs—urban renewal, model cities, rent supplements, the section 236 rental assistance program, and the section 235 homeownership assistance program.

I initially introduced this legislation as H.R. 1115 on the opening day of this Congress, in order to bring the appropriation levels—that is, the funds actually available for use or the authorizations actually available for contracting—up to their fully authorized levels.

Thus, for urban renewal, this bill appropriates an additional \$1,087,500,000—the amount representing the gap between what has been authorized by the Congress and what has in fact been appropriated by Congress. For model cities, the bill provides an additional \$836,600,000; for rent supplements, \$113,000,000; for section 235, an additional \$25 million; and for section 236, an additional \$25 million.

Each of these programs is integral to the commitment to provide a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American. The tragedy has been—and continues to be—that, while the Congress engages in handsome rhetoric and passes carefully constructed, workable programs, it fails to provide

sufficient funds to make this rhetoric and these programs meaningful.

The name of the game is money. There is simply no way around that. Without that money, the cities are stymied. They do not have the funds to produce the housing which is needed. And, as the growing housing crisis across the Nation demonstrates, without Federal funds, that housing just will not be built—at least, not housing within the financial reach of low- and moderate-income families.

Let me discuss this need just in terms of section 236, as an example. The section 236 program, enacted by passage of the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act, provides for assistance to lower income families for rental or cooperative housing, in the form of periodic payments to the mortgagee on behalf of the mortgagor. These payments serve to reduce interest costs on a market-rate project down to that which would have to be paid if the mortgage bore an interest rate of as little as 1 percent. The tenant pays no more than 25 percent of his income per month for rent.

This program is absolutely essential in New York City and New York State. It is the major Federal program relied upon by the State and city Mitchell-Lama programs. Yet, New York City alone needs approximately \$40 million of section 236 funds for fiscal year 1971. How much has it received? In fiscal year 1971, New York City's Housing and Development Administration has received, as of January 20 of this year, \$1,777,675. It may receive an additional \$321,656.

Even if it did, it would still only be receiving a little more than five percent of its actual needs.

Obviously, even the \$25 million appropriated by H.R. 1115, H.R. 4001 and H.R. 4160, with cosponsors, were provided by the Congress, New York City's needs would still far exceed the amount it would, in fact, receive. And so, too, would the needs of virtually every urban area. So, of course, we must constantly strive for greatly increased authorizations for the section 236 program, and for every other housing program. And once having succeeded, we must obtain full funding, so that the laws on the statute books have some reality in the worlds of inadequate and insufficient housing.

This year, we must obtain the additional funds—which are already authorized—for section 236, for section 235, for rent supplements, for urban renewal, and for model cities. Of course, that costs money. But, when the administration hails a trillion dollar gross national product, how can we accept any excuse for not providing the money so that the American people can live in decent housing, in decent environments, at costs they can afford? The question is, needless to say, rhetorical. No excuse is acceptable.

The following Members have joined me in cosponsoring the full funding housing supplemental appropriations bill:

Mrs. ABzug, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BURTON of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DOW, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FRASER,

Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. O'NEIL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REID of New York, and Mr. WOLFF.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this week we are joining with over a million Americans of Lithuanian descent in commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day.

The Lithuanians are a peaceful people, ethnically related to neither Germans nor Russians. In 1251, 720 years ago this month, all the Lithuanian principalities were united into one kingdom. Thus they have a long tradition of self-determination. On February 16, 1918, the modern Republic of Lithuania was formed. This month marks the 53d anniversary of this event.

It is, however, a grim and tragic observance. The independent state of Lithuania was short lived. In 1939 Kremlin troops moved into Lithuania. By 1941 the Soviet Army had taken control, beginning an era of brutal occupation that continues today.

This tiny nation, held by force, is being denied its right to independence. The Lithuanian people, accustomed to freedom and self-determination, have never ceased in their efforts to rid their country of the Communist regime. The freedom of these brave people must remain a goal and duty of Congress.

Congress has annually memorialized the establishment of the modern Lithuanian Republic. It is proper that we do so, for despite their occupation by the Soviets, the Lithuanians maintain the belief and hope that they will regain their independence.

UKRAINIANS AN INDEPENDENT PEOPLE

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in 1918, the time when war and revolution spread across Europe, the Ukrainians fought for and won their independence from the Russian Empire. Within 2 years their country was overrun by the Red army and incorporated into the Soviet Union. As a result, today over 45 million Ukrainians are living under Kremlin domination.

These people, non-Russians, are victims of Soviet colonialism imposed by the force of the Red army. They are held in bondage, denied the blessings of liberty.

Since 1920 our Ukrainian friends have fervently desired to practice the ways of democracy. They have engaged in numerous struggles against their captors who have retaliated with weapons of starvation and execution. Despite the constraints of the Communist Party, the Ukrainians still live in the faith that their nation will be free again. Their

TEMPORARY NATIONAL SECURITY COMMISSION

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the past year saw a significant—and long overdue—reassertion of congressional oversight regarding our foreign and military policy. Despite this resurgence of congressional responsibility, we are now witnessing the invasion of another nation in Southeast Asia—Laos. This follows by only months the displacement of the war into Cambodia. Clearly, the role of Congress has not yet been sufficiently asserted.

There are several means to accomplish this assertion. One is the passage of legislation. To that end, I have introduced, with 26 cosponsors, House Concurrent Resolution 50, which calls for an immediate halt to all offensive actions in Southeast Asia by United States forces and for complete withdrawal by June 30, 1971. In addition, I have cosponsored H.R. 1738, which amends the Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, Public Law 91-652, to bar the use of United States funds and forces in or over Cambodia. And I have introduced House Resolution 48, barring the use of American forces in or over Laos.

Other legislation, aimed similarly at bringing a halt to, or at least limiting, United States involvement in the misguided war in Southeast Asia, has been and will be introduced. I intend to sponsor all such legislation: for example, a bill barring the use of United States funds and forces in and over Laos; and the Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1971—the so-called revised McGovern-Hatfield amendment to end the war.

Affirmative action must be taken on this legislation, since it is obvious that this war will not end until the Congress acts to end it by cutting off all funds and authority for United States involvement, whether direct or indirect.

Another means to accomplish the assertion of congressional authority is to continue speaking out loudly and clearly, as some of us have done, and as more are beginning to do.

Still another means to accomplish the assertion of congressional authority—not just regarding the war, but as to our entire foreign and military policy structures—is to create a body which can assess these structures and the institutions which create them, influence them, and implement them. To this end, I have introduced H.R. 3578, in which 24 of my colleagues have joined as cosponsors, to establish a Temporary National Security Commission.

The genesis of this bill lies in a congressional conference which two Senators and eight Members of the House, including myself, convened in March of 1969 to study the military budget and national priorities. That conference set the stage for the subsequent debates on the military budget which have occupied both Houses of Congress in subsequent years. Almost 2 years have passed, but the need for a commission which we previously proposed remains.

The establishment of the Temporary National Security Commission will enable Congress to assert its proper role in the determination of foreign and military policy, which have joined so tragically to produce a war in which this Nation has been involved for 10 years now. The Commission would examine the institutional structure of the military-industrial complex, the relation between military policy and the economic interests which depend on the Military Establishment, and the economic and social impact of the military-industrial complex.

The Commission would consist of 17 members: five Senators, five Representatives, six private citizens appointed by these 10 elected officials, and a representative of the Comptroller General. The congressional membership would bring to bear the exercise of the Congress responsibilities. The private citizens would be persons of the highest professional and technical capacity, some scientifically trained in matters relevant to defense, and others who are experienced in international affairs. The representative of the Comptroller General would provide needed budgetary and fiscal knowledge.

The Temporary National Security Commission would make a broad-scale study of defense and security areas. While the bill we have introduced to create the Commission intentionally does not stipulate exactly which agencies and departments are to be encompassed within this study, so as to avoid undue rigidity, it does specifically require a study of those agencies and departments established by the National Security Act of 1947. These include the National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency. Likewise, all components of the National Military Establishment provided in the 1947 act would be included.

The Commission would study the foregoing agencies and their activities with a view to determining:

First, what are the current national policies and objectives in the area of defense and security and, in view of such policies and objectives, whether the national interest is being properly served by the existing agencies of Government;

Second, whether existing and projected weapons systems, military installations, management procedures, and fiscal performance of such agencies conform to national policy in the area of defense;

Third, to what extent the Defense Establishment as an institution affects individual judgment in the making and execution of policy; and

Fourth, whether the relationships between agencies of the Federal Government responsible for procurement and suppliers of goods and services require modification.

The Commission would be required to make recommendations—including suggested legislation—to the Congress, particularly with regard to the improvement of policy for national security and the effectiveness of procedures and organizations in those agencies of the Federal Government which function in the area of defense.

In brief, no aspect of defense or national security would be overlooked.

The concept of such a temporary Commission of investigation derives from the Temporary National Economic Committee, established in 1938 and chaired by Senator O'Mahoney, which conducted a study into the concentration of economic power. The findings of that committee, which existed until 1941, gave impetus to the antitrust prosecutions of that period. They generated an atmosphere which achieved basic reforms—the same atmosphere which we intend that the Temporary National Security Commission would generate.

Anyone who has watched the agonized contortions of successive administrations in justifying the war in Southeast Asia cannot help but acknowledge that a major reassessment of our foreign and military policies is in order. In even regards, it is now impossible to even determine whether—to use a colloquialism, the dog wags the tail, or the tail the dog. Does our foreign policy determine our military actions and systems, or does our Military Establishment determine our foreign policy? Do we fight a war in South Vietnam, and then Cambodia, and now Laos, because our foreign policy—misguided in any case—so dictates, or do we fight because the Pentagon has so acted, and then left the foreign policy justifications to be constructed as rationalizing afterthought?

Congress must answer these questions. The Temporary National Commission can help us to do so.

The Members who have joined me in sponsoring H.R. 3578, to create the Temporary National Security Commission, are:

Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DOW, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WOLFF.

DRAFTEES SHOULD NOT BE SENT TO VIETNAM WITHOUT THEIR CONSENT

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as I did in the last Congress, I have introduced in the 92d Congress my bill to bar the sending of nonconsenting draftees to Vietnam and the waters adjacent thereto. The bill is H.R. 1564. It is particularly timely for the Congress to act affirmatively on this legislation since the question of extending the Selective Service Act is again before Congress. It is particularly incumbent upon the Congress to face this issue because the sending of unwilling draftees year after year to die in an undeclared war in Southeast Asia is grievously wrong.

The tragic figures of deaths and casualties starkly reveal what an inequitable burden draftees have borne in this